

QUEERING THE BLACK ATLANTIC, QUEERING THE BROWN ATLANTIC

David L. Eng

*Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics,
Memory, and the Sacred*

M. Jacqui Alexander

Durham: Duke University Press, 2005. 410 pp.

Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures

Gayatri Gopinath

Durham: Duke University Press, 2005. 247 pp.

At a recent state-of-the-field queer studies conference hosted by the University of Pennsylvania to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of Gayle Rubin's groundbreaking essay "Thinking Sex," it became clear to me that the critique of the normative, which we might describe as queer studies' most important epistemic as well as political promise, is currently in the intellectual custody of three dynamic fields: transgender studies, disability studies, and area studies. For this review, I focus on area studies — more specifically, on the intersectional and interdisciplinary encounter among area studies, diaspora studies, and postcolonial studies. M. Jacqui Alexander's *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred* and Gayatri Gopinath's *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures* are two important books that illus-

trate the critical stakes in bringing together queer theory with area, diaspora, and postcolonial studies. Along with several other prominent scholars, Alexander and Gopinath have helped forge out of this encounter the burgeoning field of “queer diasporas.” Emerging most forcefully in relation to South Asian, East Asian, and Latin American studies, queer diasporas as a method demands immediate and sustained attention to how diaspora has traditionally relied on a “genealogical, implicitly heteronormative reproductive logic” (Gopinath, 10) to shore up conventional structures of family and kinship. In this manner, diaspora has reinforced dominant sexual and gendered ideologies of the nation-state that constitute it as the site of not only purity and origin but also exclusion, racial tension, and political, economic, and social strife in the West, as elsewhere.

Yet if “‘diaspora’ needs ‘queerness’ to rescue it from its genealogical implications,” Gopinath observes, “‘queerness’ also needs ‘diaspora’ in order to make it more supple in relation to questions of race, colonialism, migration, and globalization” (11). Indeed, considering queerness and diaspora together offers, in the broadest sense, important new ways to approach some of the critical aporias in all these fields. More specifically, it offers a rethinking of a long history of Euro-American modernity, sexual politics, racial formation, political economy, and migration in relation to the advent and rise of colonialism, the subsequent dilemmas of postcoloniality and decolonization in the Third World, and the current proliferation of U.S.-led global capitalism and the militarization of everyday life.

In Alexander’s estimation, a certain brand of post-structuralism has had the “effect of constructing queer theory in a way that eviscerates histories of colonialism and racial formation, frameworks that could themselves point the way to a radical activist scholarship in which race, sexual politics, and globalization would be understood together rather than being positioned as theoretical or political strangers” (70). A queer diasporic methodology maps the theoretical and political itineraries of such a critical proposition. In short, it illustrates what is at stake when disparate bodies and sexualities travel in the global system—across the Black Atlantic to the Caribbean in Alexander’s case and across the Brown Atlantic to various locales of the South Asian diaspora in Gopinath’s study.

Thus, for example, in terms of normative morality, homosexuality is conventionally characterized as “immoral” and “lewd”—“primitive” and “uncivilized”—in the West. Yet, paradoxically, homosexuality (and tolerance of it) becomes a marker of modernity and civilization when applied in non-Western contexts and to non-Western cultures. Often considered a poor imitation of more advanced Western models of social life, a recognizable gay identity becomes, Gopinath suggests, “intelligible and indeed desirable when and where it can be

incorporated into [a] developmental narrative of modernity” (142). In a transvaluation of the same logic, when taken up by conservative postcolonial and neocolonial native elites and administrations, homosexuality is often denounced and disavowed as a degenerate Western import, thus rescripting and reifying heteronormativity as the prerequisite for nation and empire, for racial purity and moral rectitude, for good citizenship and social belonging—for social life itself.

On both sides of this debate, sexuality appears as a fixed identity and property belonging to a group of authorized citizen-subjects residing in the global North, while continuing to evolve and develop elsewhere. Heightened attention to how queer diasporas complicate such fixed notions of ownership and belonging illustrates how sexuality continually exceeds its conventional boundaries in a Euro-American tradition of liberal modernity and its rights-based identity claims. Hence we witness the transformation of sexuality, as it migrates in the global system, into many other things: a discourse of development; a dialectic of Enlightenment; a geopolitics of the civilized and the primitive; a tale of racial, religious, and cultural barbarism; a story of democracy and progress; and, most recently, an index of self-determination and human rights.

Pedagogies of Crossing and *Impossible Desires* carefully unfold the manifest contradictions and intricacies of sexuality in the diaspora as it travels across different locales, public and private zones, and political and cultural fissures—indeed, helping construct and define through its various movements these locales, zones, and fissures themselves. Paying particular attention to queer diasporas as they cross not only geopolitical but also institutional boundaries, often abruptly and impolitely, Alexander’s and Gopinath’s projects disrupt and denaturalize given ways of knowing and being “over here” as well as “over there.” To borrow a concept from the postcolonial historian Dipesh Chakrabarty, they provincialize queer studies, area studies, and diaspora studies, as well as a host of other interlocking and interconnected fields, including postcolonial theory, transnational feminism, ethnic studies, and Marxism, to name some immediate examples.

Alexander’s *Pedagogies of Crossing* consists of seven chapters, divided into three sections. As she explains in the book’s opening pages,

Pedagogies’ central metaphor is drawn from the enforced Atlantic Crossing of the millions of Africans that serviced from the fifteenth century through the twentieth the consolidation of British, French, Spanish, and Dutch empires. At the time I conceived of the book in 2000, the world had not yet witnessed the seismic imperial shifts that characterize this moment. In one

sense, then, *Pedagogies* functions as an archive of empire's twenty-first-century counterpart, of oppositions to it, of the knowledges and ideologies it summons, and of the ghosts that haunt it. (2)

Alexander's three sections cover a wide historical range—from the Spaniard Vasco Núñez de Balboa's colonial conquest of the New World and his feeding of forty Indian “cross-dressers” to his dogs in 1513; to the criminalization of lesbian and gay sex by neocolonial administrations in Trinidad and Tobago in 1986 and 1991 and in the Bahamas in 1991; to our contemporary neo-imperial moment of U.S. empire, the Defense of Marriage Act, and the Patriot Act, in which “hegemonic heterosexual masculinity wishes to assert a Pax Americana through imperial violence undertaken within its own borders as well as in different parts of the world” (183).

Drawing attention to how imperialism and heterosexuality have been historically welded together by both state and corporate interests, Alexander also examines the remarkable contemporary shifts in global capitalism that mark “a systemic, interdependent relationship between heterosexual capital and gay capital” reminiscent of how “black capitalism has been called on to do a similar kind of work for white capital” (66). In the first section of *Pedagogies*, “Transnational Erotics: State, Capital, and the Decolonization of Desire” (chapters 1–2), Alexander explores this convergence in the phenomenon of gay tourism in the Bahamas and other sites in the Caribbean, investigating how capitalism reformulates sexuality and sexual desire to meet its ever-expanding needs. Gay tourism illustrates the flexibility of global capitalism. Its particular significance, Alexander notes, “lies in its ability to draw together powerful processes of sexual commodification and sexual citizenship” (27).

Alexander deftly examines the contemporary production of the rights-based consumer citizen embodied in the figure of the gay white tourist. She notes that while “citizenship based in political rights can be forfeited, these rights do not disappear entirely. Instead, they get reconfigured and restored under the rubric of gay consumer at this moment in late capitalism” (71). As brown bodies from the global South move north to take up employment as domestic labor, in agricultural sectors, and in service industries, white bodies in the global North move south in search of leisure and pleasure. In the process, they expand networks of capital, I might note, from general tourism into areas of sex tourism and medical tourism as well as related industries such as artificial reproductive technologies (e.g., “womb renting”), transnational adoption, and organ trading.

Alexander's study of gay tourism thus provides one early and important

genealogy for the current historical emergence of what I have elsewhere described as queer liberalism. Queer liberalism marks a coming together of economic and political spheres that now forms the basis for liberal enfranchisement and inclusion of particular U.S. (as well as other Western) gay and lesbian citizen-subjects petitioning for rights and recognition before the law. In this regard, Alexander's study of tourism charts the shifting legacies of colonialism and colonial travel literature and their transformations under the shadows of global capitalism. It underscores how "racialization and colonization are being consistently written into modernity's different projects. . . . [and] occasioned by the uneven class relations and differentiations produced by neo-liberal capital's dispersions" (194).

At the same time that Alexander considers how the shifting routes of global capitalism work to fold once dissident U.S. gay and lesbian citizen-subjects into its economic and political mandates, she also analyzes how these movements invoke homophobic responses by postcolonial and neocolonial administrations. That is, she illustrates how gay and lesbian tourists from the global North are being conscripted by neoliberal framings of capital, welfare reform, and sexual normalization (in the form of marriage, adoption, inheritance, etc.) as exemplary consuming citizen-subjects, even as these neoliberal mandates travel and are transformed in the diaspora into debates about postcolonial independence and heteronormative self-determination. In this manner, while gays and lesbians in the metropolitan North are being unevenly incorporated into the cultural imaginary of "We the People," citizenship in places such as the Bahamas continues to be "premised in heterosexual terms. . . . Lesbian and gay bodies are made to bear the brunt of the charge of undermining national sovereignty, while the neocolonial state masks its own role in forfeiting sovereignty as it recolonizes and renarrativizes a citizenry for service in imperial tourism" (11).

Alexander presents us with a provocative history of the present in which sovereignty is waged in the domain of sexuality and sexual regulation and asymmetrically on the backs of racialized queer immigrant bodies. Hannah Arendt famously noted that citizenship is nothing less than the "right to have rights."¹ However, Alexander concludes, critical attention to the problematic of citizenship, immigration, and alienage in queer diasporas reveals how the category of formal citizenship is simply too fragile, too fraught, and "far too subject to state manipulation and co-optation for it to become the primary basis on which radical political mobilization is carried on" (249).

If section 1 of Alexander's book presents the various movements of crossings past and crossings present that produce authorized and dissident bodies in the global system, section 2 (chapters 2–5) of her study, "Maps of Empire, Old and

New,” focuses on the “pedagogies” part of the book’s main title. Here, Alexander focuses on how we might “teach for justice”—how we might effectively and ethically intervene in state power, a project “fundamentally at odds with the project of militarization, which always already imagines an enemy and acts accordingly to eliminate it” (92). Contesting the privileged connections among capitalism, democracy, and freedom, Alexander explores how we might contest the state and corporate production of citizenship normalized within the prism of heterosexuality, a normalization whose ideological consolidation, as Louis Althusser notes, is largely the responsibility of the school in secular societies.² Alexander wonders, “What is democracy to mean when its association with the perils of empire has rendered it so thoroughly corrupt that it seems disingenuous and perilous even to deploy the term. Freedom is a similar hegemonic term, especially when associated with the imperial freedom to abrogate the self-determination of a people” (17). Through heightened attention to these particular pedagogical queries, Alexander shows “how free-market democracy might stand in the way of justice [and] how legacies of transformational struggles in the academy may not be reflected in the everyday life of an institution” (92).

Alexander presents numerous examples of such pedagogic initiatives, drawn from real-life examples of political intervention into the production of knowledge and the contestation of state power: from her musing on the social contract and John Locke (“We can’t get to liberalism and rights without John Locke, but we can watch him as he gazes at Indians in America.” [171]) to the recounting of her own battle for retention at the New School in New York City (“For almost a year, I had experienced that odd kind of alienation that results from being positioned as an onlooker in the usurpation of my own identity.” [153]). In the process, she seeks to interrupt

inherited boundaries of geography, nation, episteme, and identity that distort vision so that they can be replaced with frameworks and modes of being that enable an understanding of the dialectics of history, enough to assist in navigating the terms of learning and the fundamentally pedagogic imperative at its heart: the imperative of making the world in which we live intelligible to ourselves and to each other—in other words, teaching ourselves. (6)

Ultimately, teaching for justice would seek to undermine epistemic frameworks and practices that are simply unable to explain those itineraries of violence that gain their political force through “names such as democracy and civilization” (3).

In section 3 of *Pedagogies*, “Dangerous Memory: Secular Acts, Sacred Possession” (chapters 6–7), Alexander continues this pedagogic initiative by showing us how the personal is political and how the spiritual is political as well. She illustrates how one might go about constructing oppositional knowledges and practices by reconsidering the conventional relations between the secular and the sacred that would decidedly split the latter from the former in modernity’s self-narration of development. Here, she refuses to yield the space of the spiritual to religious fundamentalists, whose vision of sinners in the hands of an angry God sets the conceptual limits to the functions of the spiritual in social debate today. At the same time, she resists the notion that “no self-respecting postmodernist would want to align herself (at least in public) with a category such as the spiritual, which appears so fixed, so unchanging, so redolent of tradition” (15). Working against these traditions of sanctioned knowledge and practice, Alexander observes that while “humans made the Crossing, traveling only in one direction through Ocean given the name Atlantic[,] Grief traveled as well” (289).

Alexander draws on this history of grief—exemplifying the recent affective turn in queer studies—through her experiences with Santeria and Vodou. Such experiences lead her to commune with a slave woman named Kitsimba, who made her own Atlantic Crossing in the eighteenth-century, as well as with other sisters of color, ancestrally recalled in *This Bridge Called My Back*.³ “In the realm of the secular,” Alexander remarks, “the material is conceived of as tangible while the spiritual is either nonexistent or invisible. In the realm of the Sacred, however, the invisible constitutes its presence by a provocation of sorts, by provoking our attention” (307). We may choose to ignore the Sacred. However, attuned to its effects, and to its affective valences, the spiritual promises to lead us elsewhere, yielding forms of knowledge and practice that evade the instrumental radar of empiricism and scientific rationality, the cornerstones of Enlightenment thinking.

Understanding that ghosts and spirits do not depend on our collective acknowledgment to validate their existences provides a new way to approach Bruno Latour’s insistence that “we have never been modern”—or, at least, quite as modern as we would like to believe. Even more, it allows those left out of modernity’s instrumental reason to make better sense of a social world that outsources them as collateral damage. Alexander summarizes,

I wish to examine how spiritual practitioners employ metaphysical systems to provide the moorings for their meanings and understanding of self—in short, how they constitute or remember experience as Sacred and how that experience shapes their subjectivity. Experience is a category of great

epistemic import to feminism. But we have understood it primarily as secularized, as if it were absent Spirit and thus antithetical, albeit indirectly, to the Sacred. (295)

By queering the Black Atlantic in these provocative ways, Alexander offers bold ways to reimagine and rethink the intersectional and interdisciplinary relationships among queer studies, area studies, diaspora studies, postcoloniality, transnational feminism, ethnic studies, Marxism, and globalization. Indeed, such a queering of the Black Atlantic is long overdue. Alexander's specific attention to the postcolonial Caribbean highlights issues of sovereignty, citizenship, immigration, and social belonging, placing Afro-diaspora and African American studies in more immediate conversation with Asian/Asian American studies as well as Latin/Latin American studies, whose long-time engagements with these categories have helped fuel the critique of hetero- and homonormativity, kinship, and elective affiliation in the field of queer diasporas. Alexander's methodology draws sustained attention to different and uneven histories of slavery, coerced migration, and indentureship that construct these legal and social formalizations. Furthermore, her focus on the queer Caribbean supplements the more cosmopolitan emphases of Afro-diaspora in the Black Atlantic (which connect, for example, the metropolitan capitals of New York, London, and Paris). As Alexander notes:

There is a great deal of urgency for us to map . . . some crucial analytic shifts that will prompt postcolonial studies to engage more strategically with the "here and there," to position immigration, for instance, as an important site for the local reconfiguration of subalternity and the local reconfiguration of race. . . . As certain strands of queer studies move to take up more centrally questions of political economy and racial formation, and of transnational feminism and immigrant labor, the analytic vise in the discipline will be sharpened between those who hold on to a representational democratic focus within U.S. borders and those who espouse an antipathy toward the links between political economy and sexuality. (253)

In bringing together all these various and distinct fields, Alexander's project provides a compelling account of what Lisa Lowe describes as the "Intimacies of Four Continents"—the material as well as philosophical dialectic of African slave and Asian indentured labor, of which the Caribbean is a prime exemplum, subtending the dialectic of Euro-American modernity. This crucial but disavowed

correspondence provides an alternative history to the affirmation of human freedom and the forgetting of race in the Americas, a “perverse modernity.”

Attention to questions of the visible and invisible are also central to Gopinath's *Impossible Desires*. Her study, consisting of six chapters and an epilogue, draws together a diverse set of cultural texts—from South Asian diasporic film, literature, music, and photography—to construct an archive of “impossible desires” whose erotic itineraries are linked to a queer female subjectivity that is often made to disappear in the epistemological protocols of the various fields with which she is engaged. In Gopinath's book, attention to this queer female subjectivity reworks a number of dominant perspectives across several fields. For example, *Impossible Desire* contests the insistent and asymmetrical attention to gay male agency and desire that defines much of GLBTQ studies. As she puts it, “How do we clear the theoretical and representational space to imagine a queer subjectivity that is not always already male, or a female subjectivity that is not always already heterosexual” (78)? In this manner, Gopinath also shifts consideration from dominant analyses of *gender* in transnational feminism by considering what is at stake in focusing critical attention on the category of transnational *sexuality* developed by a queer diasporic (and queer of color) critique of family, kinship, and nation. “The failure of feminist scholars of South Asia and the South Asian diaspora,” she observes, “to fully interrogate heterosexuality as a structuring mechanism of both state and diasporic nationalisms makes clear the indispensability of a queer critique” (10). Despite powerful analyses of “woman” as “emblematic of the concept of home and nation, as feminized domestic space, and as a site of chaste and unsullied spirituality,” postcolonial feminism is “marked by a curious lack of attention to the production of heterosexuality and homosexuality within these discourses” (136). From a slightly different perspective, Gopinath refuses a heteronormative logic of postcolonial sovereignty that would situate “the terms ‘queer’ and ‘diaspora’ as dependent on the originality of ‘heterosexuality’ and ‘nation’” (13).

Locating a queer South Asian female subject as the starting point for theorizing queer diasporas narrates “a different story of how global capitalism impacts local sites by articulating other forms of subjectivity, culture, affect, kinship, and community that may not be visible or audible within standard mappings of nation, diaspora, or globalization” (12). These are communities that lack social power but nevertheless have presence. Throughout her analyses, Gopinath emphasizes that within “the patriarchal logic of an Indian immigrant bourgeoisie, a ‘nonheterosexual Indian woman’ occupies a space of impossibility, in that she is not only excluded from the various ‘home’ spaces that the ‘woman’ is enjoined to inhabit

and symbolize but, quite literally, simply cannot be imagined” (18). Gopinath proceeds to imagine these figures of impossibility and how they pose an insistent challenge to the logics of South Asian patriarchy at home and abroad. Her readings unfold along a terrain of the unimaginable, the ephemeral, and the invisible, invoking a range of “dissident and non-heteronormative practices and desires that may very well be incommensurate with the [Western] identity categories of ‘gay’ and ‘lesbian’” (11).

The book’s careful attention to an archive of female desire embodied in a host of domestic figures—mothers, daughters, wives, in-laws, maids, and courtesans—is spread across a wide spectrum on both sides of the “Brown Atlantic” and (largely) the global North: in the United States, Canada, the Caribbean, the United Kingdom, and India; in mainstream, Bollywood, and independent cinema (such as Gurinder Chadha’s *Bend It Like Beckham* [2002], Girish Karnad’s *Utsav* [1984], Deepa Mehta’s *Fire* [1996], Mira Nair’s *Monsoon Wedding* [2001], Damien O’Donnell’s *East Is East* [1999], and Pratibha Parmar’s *Khush* [1991]); in literature (including works by Ismat Chughtai, Shani Mootoo, V. S. Naipaul, and Shyam Selvadurai); in music (bhangra, new Asian dance music); and in photography (by Parminder Sekhon). Throughout, Gopinath attends to how the space of the “domestic”—defined here as both “home” and “nation”—is reconfigured by queer diasporas.

Unlike the developmental trajectories of gay and lesbian coming-of-age narratives in the West, which culminate with the rejection of home and the confines of the closet, Gopinath’s archive insistently holds on to and reclaims the space of the domestic, working and reworking its sexual protocols and its private-public boundaries for its own purposes. In her analysis of the director Ian Iqbal Rashid’s *Surviving Sabu* (1998) and O’Donnell’s *East Is East*, Gopinath observes that “home” is

not simply or necessarily the place from which the queer subject is evicted or exiled. Rather, “home” is a space that is ruptured by and imaginatively transformed by queer diasporic subjects even as they remain within its confines. This queer transformation of the diasporic “home” constitutes a remarkably powerful challenge to dominant ideologies of community and nation in ways that may very well escape intelligibility within a logic of visibility and “coming out.” (79)

Notably, the “stars” of Gopinath’s domestic dramas are not cross-dressers or butch lesbians. Rather, female homoeroticism is consistently signaled in the

films and writings she analyzes by a hyperbolic and spectacularized femininity detached from its heterosexual moorings. The South Asian femme suffuses the space of the home, and rather than exist in an exilic relationship to it, she challenges the Western tendency to imagine gays and lesbians as primarily located in the space of the public sphere (“We’re here, we’re queer, get used to it!”). At the same time, she reworks the dominant epistemic tropes of visibility and invisibility, public and private, that “may exist outside, or indeed, within a Euro-American context” (145). In Gopinath’s *Impossible Desires*, home might be described as delineating an alternative public sphere. Home is not private, as theorized under liberalism. Instead, it is a crucial public site of labor within the global restructuring of capitalism. Here, the femme’s queer desire exceeds the male state lineages that define conservative notions of nationhood and diaspora as the privileged zone of filial prerogative, challenging South Asian native as well as immigrant patriarchy (such as Hindu nationalism).

In a spectacular reading of the Urdu writer Ismat Chughtai’s 1941 short story “Lihaf” (“The Quilt”), Gopinath extends this analysis by rethinking the “will-to-see” that attends the politics of the closet, the emergence of female same-sex relations, and the demands for visibility in the West. Chughtai’s narrator, a young girl visiting the upper-class Muslim household of her aunt, witnesses some sort of relationship between the sequestered aunt and her female maidservant. Each evening, the little girl is drawn to the energetic contortions emanating from the two figures under the quilt. Yet when all is revealed, when the quilt is ultimately lifted, the narrator curiously refuses disclosure: “What I saw when the quilt was lifted, I will never tell anyone, not even if they give me a lakh of rupees.” Contesting the Western logics of the “will-to-see,” Gopinath writes that the “quilt can be read not so much as a kind of concealing device beneath which the ‘truth’ of visual ‘proof’ of sex and desire lie, as much as a kind of mediating and constantly shifting surface that negotiates and marks the borders between different economies and organizations of erotic pleasure” (150). Here, her careful attention to this reworking of the boundaries of domestic space and knowledge extends beyond the epistemology of the closet in the West to offer new spaces and critical approaches in theories of transnational feminism, postcoloniality, and globalization.

Feminist theory has done much to denaturalize the artificial boundaries separating public and private in liberal society that facilitate gendered domination in political, economic, and social life. For instance, the conflation and confusion of two different private spheres—the home and the market—subtending the public sphere make possible the uncompensated exploitation of female domestic labor in the “private” space of the home. Transnational feminists have rightly extended

this critique to consider how the hyperexploitation of domestic labor from the global South inserts Third-World women (as well as men) into this gendered equation, a reconfigured disparity between home and work as well as two other forms of the “domestic”—that is, the domestic nation-states of the North and those of the South under neoliberal globalization. Gopinath’s attention to queer female desire’s reformulation of these indeterminate boundaries points to how public and private, home and market, kinship and corporation, and home and nation-state do not easily map onto South Asian and South Asian diasporic political economies through such binaries. Furthermore, it also stresses how categories of female sexuality are insistently deployed and regulated to stabilize these precarious distinctions in the homeland and the diaspora.

In sum, Gopinath, like Alexander, boldly charts a history of the present in which heteronormativity and contemporary nationalisms are neither a natural nor an inevitable result of neoliberal globalization marching across the world. In both books, queer diasporas place South Asian and Caribbean perspectives at the center of transnational feminism, postcolonial studies, and critical race theory to consider the numerous ways by which attention to female sexuality in the global South presents us with histories of the past and present that do not march to the beat of enlightened liberalism’s deafening drums. To the contrary, the field of queer diasporas provides a compelling account of how a turn to queer circuits of desire might interrupt the dominant itineraries of globalization and the current ascension of queer liberalism as one of its regnant effects. Ultimately, it works to keep queer studies queer.

Note

1. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt, 1968), 296.
2. Louis Althusser, “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation),” in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971), 132, 143.
3. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds., *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color* (New York: Kitchen Table Press, Women of Color Press, 1984).